

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VI, No. 13

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

August 1, 1976

## Stever Appointed to White House Science Post

One of the less-inspirational chapters in science and government relations came to a conclusion July 21, when President Ford, apparently satisfied that he holds a secure delegate margin over Ronald Reagan, nominated H. Guyford Stever to head the newly re-established White House science office.

The nomination was close to public announcement approximately two months earlier, but Stever, though a model of the non-partisan public servant during 4 years as director of the National Science Foundation, had the misfortune to attract some quasi-lunatic potshots from the Republican right. Determined to avoid any embarrassment to the President's quest for convention delegates, the dutiful Dr. Stever asked Ford to reconsider his selection. And that's what Gerald Ford did (SGR Vol. VI, No. 12), right up to and just past the moment when the convention arithmetic added up to safe.

Among the assorted ironies in the bungled birth of the

### *Atkinson to Take Over As Acting NSF Head--See Page 2*

Office of Science and Technology Policy is that Stever did not want the job of director, which carries with it the dual post of presidential science adviser. Furthermore, as part-time presidential science adviser, under a Nixon re-organization that wiped out the old Office of Science and Technology, Stever was not altogether persuaded that a return to the Executive Office premises was all that important in national science-policy affairs. He said as much when the Administration was indifferent to Congressional agitation to revive the White House office, and then, when the Administration reversed itself last year, lent his support to the new position.

After the legislation cleared Congress last spring and was on the way to a May 11 presidential signing ceremony, Stever was among several persons considered in the running for the job. But he made it clear that his preference was for winding up his government service shortly after election day to move on to another job. At age 59, and with the presidency of Carnegie-Mellon University behind him, Stever is prime material for one or another top position, and the offers have not been lacking.

However, as the other candidates wilted away in syn-

chrony with Ford's drooping election chances, attention focused on Stever. Reluctantly, he said he would accept, and the announcement of his nomination was about to be made when 4 Republican senatorial conservatives dumped on him in a letter to Ford. Whereupon, Stever discreetly withdrew in deference to the President's convention difficulties.

The complaint of the 4 — Helms (N.C.), Curtis (Neb.), McClure (Idaho), and Hansen (Wyo.) — centered on assorted rightwing mouthings about NSF's support of social science curriculum programs that are said to be inconsistent with traditional American values. In dollar amounts and impact, the programs constitute

*(Continued on Page 2)*

## In Brief

Who's likely to rank high in science-policy affairs in a Carter Administration? Lots of names are circulating around, but one that is often heard is Lewis Branscomb, the former Bureau of Standards director who is now Chief Scientist for IBM. Though based in Armonk, NY, Branscomb has kept in close touch with national science policy through membership on several high-level Federal advisory committees in Washington.

That \$6-million libel suit that a Michigan researcher filed last April against Senator William Proxmire and a staff aide (SGR Vol. VI, No. 8) is slowly moving through the legal system. The defense has filed petitions for dismissal and, failing that, a change of venue from Madison, Wisc., to Washington. The original judge has disqualified himself on grounds of an acquaintanceship with Proxmire, and his replacement, drawn from federal court in Chicago, is on vacation.

The Defense Department's goldplated military medical school — the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences — has emerged untouched from another challenge to its ever-costlier existence (SGR Vol. VI, No. 11) and even its staunchest opponents now concede that it's home free. The latest attempt to cut it off before it goes into operation was led by Senator Proxmire. However, he was unable to be present to offer an amendment in committee and was ruled out of order last month when he tried to introduce it on the floor. The school, under construction in Bethesda, Md., soon receives its first class. A Proxmire aide sourly noted, "It's here for keeps."

## ***For First Time, a Social Scientist Will Be at NSF Helm***

With Director H. Guyford Stever leaving the National Science Foundation to become White House science adviser, a social scientist, Richard T. Atkinson, will head up the Foundation for the first time in its quarter-century existence. The appointment, however, is likely to be brief and almost certainly will remain on an acting basis.

Atkinson, a Stanford University psychologist who was appointed NSF deputy director last year, was alerted several months ago for the takeover when Stever became the leading choice for the White House post. Atkinson told SGR that he is pleased to have the appointment, does not intend merely to keep the seat warm, but plans to be back at Stanford no later than a year from now. Though he is a

registered Democrat and participated in some party affairs in California, he said that he would not expect a Carter Administration to ask him to remain on a longterm basis, nor, he said, would he want to. "I want to get back to being a professor," he said.

Atkinson said that he intends to concentrate on 2 tasks — the formulation of the NSF budget and a high-level study "to take a look at the future of science so we can see where we should be putting our support."

The director and deputy director of NSF are presidential appointees, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The deputy automatically succeeds to the acting directorship in the absence of the chief.

### ***Stever (Continued From Page 1)***

a minuscule slice of NSF's activities. But the 4 Senators, citing some minor irregularities in the administration and financing of the projects, threatened to make a row over the nomination.

If Ford and his timorous White House crew did not signal Stever to pull back, they certainly were not disappointed when he did; for if they had wanted to bring the nomination out into the public, there was nothing to prevent them from doing so — apart from their fear that the 4 sniping Senators might cost them some convention delegates.

One reason that Stever was reluctant to take the job is that time is running out on the Ford Administration, and even if the incredible occurs, Stever does not wish to stay on the past the end of the present Administration. That means that at best, he will have about 5 months to get the office going. The campaign period is the worst of all possible times for a science adviser to attract the President's attention, since relatively few science-related matters harmonize with the stuff of which campaigns are made. Since the office will be in a start-up position during the coming months, that may not be a misfortune. However, since Washington has pretty well written off Ford's election chances, the acquisition of staff is going to be a serious problem. The most

promising recruiting ground is likely to be among the staff members whom Stever gathered together to support him at NSF in his role as part-time presidential science adviser. But these folks read the papers, too, and may not be inclined to trade their safe berths at NSF for lame duck status on an Executive Office staff for which Carter has his own candidates.

The best that can be said about the long-awaited re-establishment of OSTP is that it is off and crawling, and that its real commencement will be after Jan. 20.—DSG

## **Confirmation Seems Certain**

Despite right-wing threats to oppose Stever's nomination, swift approval by the Senate was virtually assured when Stever received a warm reception July 28 at a 90-minute hearing before the 3 committees that handled the legislation for the new science office.

A sure signal that the anti's have gathered no support was provided by Senator Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), who expressed strong approval of the appointment. The only stated opposition was from Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC). He was absent from the proceedings but submitted a statement for the record.

## **Science & Government Report © 1976**

Contributing Editors

**Colin Norman, Pamela Moore**

Editor and Publisher

**Daniel S. Greenberg**

Circulation Manager

**Alice Anne Freund**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$65 (two years, \$120); individuals, \$44 (two years, \$75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

## Nuclear Commission Weighs Curbs on India Aid

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), a relatively minor federal agency, is about to make a major foreign policy decision. In the next few weeks, it must decide whether or not to allow some 12,261 kilograms of slightly enriched uranium to be exported to India under a longstanding agreement to fuel the Tarapur Atomic Power Station, near Bombay.

Its decision, which can be overturned only by Congress, will be a major test of the United States' resolve to limit the spread of atomic weapons by placing strict safeguards on commercial sales of reactor technology and materials.

The four NRC Commissioners — a fifth place is vacant following the appointment of former chairman William Anders as Ambassador to Norway — are clearly uncomfortable in their new role as foreign policy makers. But, since the Administration lacks a coherent, explicit policy on nuclear exports, they have been forced to set a policy themselves. NRC's stake in the matter arises from its statutory requirement to determine whether the granting of specific nuclear export licences would be "inimical to the common defense and security of the United States."

In the case of exports to India, the determination is colored by the fact that on May 18, 1974, India exploded an atomic device manufactured from plutonium produced in a Canadian-supplied reactor and separated in an Indian reprocessing plant. That development led Canada to shut off all further nuclear assistance to India, and a number of American arms control experts are urging the United States to follow suit — at least until India promises not to produce more explosives and accepts additional safeguards on its nuclear facilities.

The United States has provided fuel for the Tarapur reactor for more than a decade under a unique agreement. It specifies that no other fuel can be used in the reactor, that the United States has an option to buy back spent fuel from the reactor and the power to veto reprocessing of the fuel in India, and that the flow of fuel through the reactor is monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

But opponents of the proposed sale argue that these safeguards are insufficient, and they petitioned the NRC to hold public hearings on the export licence application. The Commission agreed, and held unprecedented hearings on July 20 and 21.

The most fundamental objection to the proposed sale was raised by a number of arms control experts, including former CIA R&D director Herbert Scoville and a former deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Adrian Fisher. Both argued that

### *Carter Aide Cites Backing For Presidential Science Office*

According to a close associate of Jimmy Carter, the Democratic candidate would be a strong supporter of research as President, and backs the restoration of science advice to the White House staff.

Speaking in June to a mental health conference in Washington, Peter Bourne, a psychiatrist who heads Washington campaign operations for Carter, said the following:

"Governor Carter comes out of a scientific background. As many of you know, he received training as a nuclear engineer when he was in the Navy and has a great deal of interest in the field of science in general. I think he has a great deal of interest not merely in biomedical research but [in] basic research across the board.

"I know that he has been very concerned, for instance, by the elimination by this Administration [actually, it was by the Nixon Administration—ed.] of the Office of Science and Technology in the White House . . . If it's not satisfactorily instituted by the time he takes office [he] would want to see a major role for a science adviser in the White House.

"And I think that his own understanding, because of his background, of the need for basic research as a key element in the strength of this country, is very strong and he would certainly like to see research in all fields strongly enhanced when he is President."

continued supply of nuclear fuel to India would be seen by other potential nuclear weapons aspirants as tacit approval of India's nuclear explosives program.

Along with representatives from the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Sierra Club, and the Natural Resources Defense Council — the three groups which petitioned for the hearings — they argued that further fuel supplies to India should be made only if India accepts a number of rigid conditions. First, all spent fuel from Tarapur already accumulated in India should be returned to the United States. Second, India should agree not to produce more explosive devices. Third, India should place all its nuclear facilities under international safeguards. And finally, there should be no reprocessing of spent fuel in India, at least for the time

*(Continued on Page 4)*

## Cambridge, Mass., Council Sets up DNA Review

*Cambridge, Mass.* Harvard researchers, the Cambridge City Council, and the town's irascible Mayor, Alfred E. Vellucci, have recently provided an entertaining, though not entirely commendable, example of public involvement in complex decisions concerning scientific research.

Last month, after a series of bitter confrontations between opposing groups of scientists, plus 2 extraordinary Council sessions, the City Council imposed a 3-month moratorium on certain types of recombinant DNA research within its jurisdiction, which includes Harvard and MIT. Though the moratorium will not stop any current experiments, the Council's decision to declare an area of research off limits has few direct precedents. It could also have lasting implications, especially if officials in other cities decide to follow Mayor Vellucci's example.

The full implications for Harvard and MIT will not become clear for some time, however. The issue has been turned over to a special commission, also established by the Council last month, which has been given the task of recommending a policy governing recombinant DNA experiments in Cambridge.

It should be recalled that, for the past 2 years, groups of scientists have been postponing many kinds of recombinant DNA experiments while the National Institutes of Health has been going through a torturous process of setting safety guidelines for the research. The final version of those guidelines was published on June 23 (SGR Vol. VI, No. 12). It outlaws some experiments and sets out in detail physical and biological safety precautions which must be used for others.

Though the NIH guidelines almost certainly have the  
(Continued on Page 5)

### India (Continued From Page 3)

being.

The State Department, whose views were presented by Myron Kratzer, a senior science policy official, argues, however, that denial of the license application would set back US non-proliferation policies since it would destroy the credibility of the United States as a reliable supplier of nuclear technology and services. Potential nuclear buyers would simply look elsewhere for their nuclear technology, and get it from sources which require less stringent safeguards, he suggested.

Moreover, Kratzer hinted that the Indians could indulge in a bit of subtle blackmail if the United States tries to abrogate its agreement to fuel the Tarapur reactor. The Indian government could claim that if the agreement is broken, the spent fuel already accumulated in India would no longer be safeguarded. It could then be reprocessed to provide plutonium for scores of explosives. That possible threat is made more realistic by the fact that a large reprocessing plant has recently been constructed close to the Tarapur reactors.

At least that possible threat seemed to provide one area of agreement between supporters and opponents of the proposed sale. They all argued the United States should exercise its option to buy back spent fuel from the Tarapur reactors. Kratzer indicated that the State Department is exploring such a possibility, and later in the week Fred Ikle, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Indians would "like to be cooperative" in such an arrangement.

It is generally expected that the NRC will approve the

fuel exports on condition that the spent fuel already in India is returned to the United States and that future wastes from the reactor are also sent back. Since there is no capacity in the United States for reprocessing commercial reactor wastes, however, it is not entirely clear what will be done with the 200,000 kilograms of highly radioactive fuel rods.

If the NRC does arrive at such a decision, it would still leave the overall US nuclear export policies in a state of some incoherence. Last month, President Ford signed into law a foreign aid bill which requires that US assistance be denied those countries which buy or sell uranium enrichment or fuel reprocessing plants (SGR Vol. VI, No. 11).

Thus the Administration is forced by law to take a tough line in discouraging the transfer of the more sensitive nuclear technologies.

But US credibility in discouraging such exports is being undermined by other actions. Last month, for example, the Administration approved the sale of reactors to Israel and Egypt (those agreements must be ratified by Congress) and the sale of a reactor to Spain, all of which are counted among potential nuclear weapons states.

At least the hearings over fuel exports to India have provided a useful public exchange of views. But the NRC is not really the place for the formulation of US foreign policy, and in the next few months the issues are likely to surface more frequently in Congress. Foreign relations committees in the House and Senate have already begun to take up the issue, and extensive hearing have also been held by the Senate Government Operations Committee.—CN



## ...City Elders Aroused by Lack of Consultation

*(Continued From Page 4)*

backing of most scientists — in fact, they are widely regarded as being stricter than necessary to guard against potential health hazards — such assurances have not been put to the test of public acceptability. It was perhaps inevitable that the first test would come in Cambridge.

Harvard and MIT house both a lot of bright scientists eager to use the recombinant DNA technique and some of the most articulate and forceful opponents of the research. In fact, throughout the process which led to the adoption of the NIH guidelines, Cambridge scientists were among the most vocal advocates of the strictest possible safety controls on recombinant DNA experiments. Another reason why the issue is particularly explosive in Cambridge is that relations between the city and its two wealthy universities are abysmal. In his 26 years on the City Council, Mayor Vellucci has scored considerable political success by attacking the universities, which happen to be located in a working-class community. His aggression probably reached its peak a few years ago when he got the Council to pass a resolution to pave over Harvard Yard and turn it into a parking lot. Clearly, Mayor Vellucci is not one to miss an opportunity to demonstrate who is boss in Cambridge, especially when the universities hand him the opportunity on a plate.

In this case, the opportunity came when the universities failed to involve City officials in their plans for conducting recombinant DNA research. And when they were brought in, it was in an atmosphere of confrontation.

The dispute began over a proposal to convert some rooms in Harvard's old biology laboratories into a safety facility. Though designed originally for work with animal viruses, the planned safety facility would meet requirements specified in the NIH guidelines for a moderate containment, or P3, laboratory. (The guidelines define four levels of safety conditions, ranging from use of standard microbiological techniques, P1, to use of special laboratories akin to biological warfare facilities, P4.) Construction of the safety lab would enable Harvard researchers to conduct a number of experiments which the guidelines assign to P3 level facilities, and which cannot now be done at the university because Harvard has no such facility. Several other universities, it should be noted, are in the same position.

The proposed safety lab became a focus of dispute when it became known that recombinant DNA studies were indeed planned to take place in it. Opponents of the research then zeroed in on the plans for the lab, but they were not too successful in pushing their case within

the university. A special Harvard biohazards committee approved the project in principle earlier this year, as did Harvard's Committee on Research Policy and the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Mayor Vellucci and his council became involved in the issue through two routes. First, early in June an article describing the Harvard dispute was published in the Boston *Phoenix*, a weekly community newspaper. And second, Vellucci received a visit from Nobel Prize-winner George Wald, who outlined his concerns about the hazards involved in recombinant DNA research.

Vellucci promptly issued a statement saying that he was not prepared to allow researchers to endanger the lives of Cambridge residents, and he called a Council meeting on June 23 to discuss the matter.

That meeting was variously described as a circus and an inquisition. But a key exchange occurred between Vellucci and Harvard scientists over the fact that no City official was informed of plans for the safety facility, and there were no City representatives on the Harvard biohazards committee. Vellucci was particularly upset that he first heard of the plans through the newspapers. Most of the meeting was devoted to testimony from supporters and critics of the NIH guidelines, and the debate was similar to the arguments which have been going on in the scientific community for the past couple of years.

Half way through the meeting, Vellucci introduced a resolution calling for a 2-year ban on all recombinant DNA experiments in Cambridge, including those judged

*(Continued on Page 6)*

## Letter to the Editor

I read with interest the May 15 article, "Shifts Urged in Federal Graduate Study Support," which describes the report recently released by the Committee on a Study of National Needs for Biomedical and Behavioral Research Personnel.

As staff director for this Committee, I feel it my obligation to bring one minor — but critical — inaccuracy to your attention. On page 5, the recommendation to shift the proportion of predoctoral and postdoctoral training awards in the behavioral sciences has been misquoted. In actual fact the Committee is recommending a shift from 90% predoctoral/10% postdoctoral to 30% predoctoral/70% postdoctoral — and not 70% predoctoral/30% postdoctoral as your article indicates.

Herbert B. Pahl, Ph.D.

## Cambridge Head: "Caught Harvard Just in Time"

(Continued From Page 5)

to entail little risk and which do not require special safety facilities. "We caught Harvard just in time," he boasted at one point. The meeting was adjourned before a vote was taken on his resolution, however, and a second session was called for July 7.

A number of critical events occurred between the 2 meetings. First, Vellucci put out a statement suggesting that a "cooling off" period is required, and he proposed that instead of a 2-year moratorium, there should be only a 3-month pause. He then proposed a resolution to establish a commission, consisting of scientists and city residents, to recommend a policy governing recombinant DNA studies.

The July 7 meeting was similar to the earlier gathering, with scientists from both sides heatedly stating their views. But when Vellucci's proposal for a 3-month moratorium came under discussion, it was again significantly weakened. Councillor David Clem, a young Texan who is a Ph.D. candidate at MIT, proposed that the ban be applied only to experiments which, according to the NIH guidelines, require P3 or P4 level facilities. The amendment was accepted without debate, and the resolution was approved, 5-4. The resolution establishing the commission was similarly approved.

Clem's amendment was critical because no P3 or P4 level recombinant DNA experiments are now being conducted at Harvard or MIT. Harvard has no such facilities, and though MIT has a P3 lab, no P3-level experiments have yet been started there.

Many Cambridge scientists are therefore happy with the fact that the restrictions have been drastically softened from Vellucci's original proposals, and they are hoping that the issue will quietly die away. But it probably won't.

The commission will be treading the same ground the NIH committee crossed when it hammered out the federal guidelines. That torturous process took 18 months of hardfought, complex debate. The Cambridge committee has only a few weeks, and if it does not come up with a proposal within its allotted time, the issue will probably boil up again.

Moreover, a little-noticed aspect of the commission's mandate requires it to look into other areas of research at Harvard and MIT, to make certain that no experiments pose a threat to public health. With virtually an open hunting license, the commission has plenty of scope for mischief.

A key consideration is whether the Cambridge dispute will spread to other cities. So far, there is no evidence of

such a development, but Vellucci has been trying to interest his fellow mayors in the issue. Last month, he proposed a resolution at the Conference of Mayors, requiring universities to notify city officials of plans to conduct recombinant DNA experiments, and calling for hearings so that the public can be brought into discussions of the hazards and benefits associated with the research. The resolution was referred to a committee, and Vellucci says that he intends to pursue it vigorously in the next few months.

Ever since July 1974, when a group of geneticists led by Paul Berg of Stanford urged that a moratorium be placed on some recombinant DNA experiments, scientists who want to perform the research have shown considerable restraint. They have delayed their experiments to devise safety procedures, and have gone through a public process of setting controls on the research. They would therefore find it particularly galling if legislative bodies around the country start to second-guess the federal guidelines and impose their own restrictions on the experiments.

The Cambridge dispute again demonstrates, though more dramatically than in most other instances, that scientists can no longer expect to conduct all their professional affairs in isolation. Where issues of public concern are involved, the public demands a piece of the decisionmaking process. And preferably at an early stage.—CN

### 20 Bids for Solar Institute

Twenty proposals to serve as "manager-operator" of the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI) have been deemed "acceptable for comprehensive evaluation" by the Energy Research and Development Administration, the agency in charge of the widely sought after facility.

According to an ERDA spokesman, no contestants have yet been eliminated. All those beyond the 20, he explained, were in the category of "inquiries" rather than applications.

ERDA's timetable calls for a decision in late November or early December, which presumably puts SERI beyond the reach of election-year trading. The first year of operation is expected to be budgeted for \$4-6 million. The proposals will be evaluated by a board of ERDA employees and the final selection will be made by ERDA Administrator Robert C. Seamans Jr.

## Study Urges Shift in US Aid for Mental Health Training

On the face of it, the federal agency charged with bettering the nation's mental health has decided that the making of psychiatrists, psychologists and other mental health specialists may not be the best way to proceed. After more than 25 years of helping to produce mental health professionals — over 50,000 of them by conservative estimates — the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and its parent agency, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA), have proposed a different course.

A tentative plan, recently submitted by ADAMHA to Assistant Secretary for Health Theodore Cooper as part of agency-wide future planning, calls for providing mental health training for primary-care givers, physicians and other health workers, rather than for continued federal training support for the big 4 mental health professions: psychiatry, psychology, social work and psychiatric nursing. More often divided than not, the major organizations representing those professions are relatively united in opposition to the plan. According to an official of one: "NIMH is crazy."

Under the plan, developed largely without the advice or consent of that professional constituency, the federal money which traditionally has gone for individual student support and to departments of psychiatry, psychology, schools of social work and nursing would be directed toward psychiatry and other medical school departments, but for the training of front-line primary care providers, not mental health professionals. The proposal also calls for incentives to states to broaden their existing mandate for planning mental health services to include systematic manpower planning as well. Support for states would be contingent on their attending to NIMH's national service priorities: community-based mental health programs, services to special underserved "target" populations (minorities, children, the aged), de-institutionalization, and preventive services.

Arguments for such change appear in option papers produced by 3 internal NIMH task forces on service manpower which conducted a year-long look at the history of the agency's clinical and service training programs. One panel concluded that it is unlikely that enough mental health specialists can be provided to meet the need, and noted that more persons with emotional problems are seen by generic care-givers on any given day "than could possibly be seen by mental health specialists."

It also reasoned that specialist treatment often works against treating the whole person and stated that a con-

siderable proportion of those who need help for physical ailments have emotional problems too. The panel cautioned, however, that without intensive training, "generic care-givers cannot substitute for mental health specialists."

Another panel pointed out that although community mental health centers constitute NIMH's primary service priority, the agency's service training programs turn out many professionals who do not pursue careers in community programs or who are not equipped for them. According to a 1973 survey, only 27 per cent of community mental health center staffs came from the 4 core mental health professions. The panel report said current training programs "are not specifically designed or organized to prepare people for organized care settings."

While the task force reports lay out the rationale for some change in NIMH's service training programs, the extent and nature of the change proposed in the ADAMHA draft are due to some larger influences, not the least of which is unremitting pressure from the Office of Management and Budget to phase out mental health training programs.

As the plan points out, since 1972, ADAMHA clinical manpower programs "have annually been proposed for phaseout by the Administration. Each year Congress has restored these programs, though usually at progressively lower levels of funding, and under circumstances permitting no systematic program redirection."

By NIMH's own rough estimates, the agency has provided direct stipend support for the training of more than 12,000 psychiatrists, over 11,000 psychologists, more than 17,000 social workers and about 9500 psychiatric nurses — not counting support for institutional programs.

In the current year alone, NIMH guesses it is providing stipend support for 859 psychiatric residents, 1762 psychology trainees, 1073 social workers, and 1169 psychiatric and mental health nurses-in-training.

At this point, it is unclear what, if anything, will happen to the ADAMHA plan. The only thing that is clear is that the proposal has aroused the mental health community. One seasoned observer of ADAMHA speculates that the plan may do what he thinks was intended: sufficiently shake up the agency's professional constituency in order to lay down future conditions for training support. With the ADAMHA plan as an alternative, almost any other change would be welcome.—PM

## In Quotes: A Bit of Dialog from Capitol Hill

*When federal research administrators go to Capitol Hill to discuss their budget requests, respectful response to the representatives of the people is mandatory — no matter how far afield the questioning may wander. As an illustration, SGR offers the following exchanges, which took place in February between Frank J. Rauscher Jr., director of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), and Reps. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) and Edward H. Patten (D-NJ.), members of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the NCI budget:*

Natcher. You mentioned tobacco a few minutes ago. You know I am from Kentucky, Doctor.

Patten. He mentioned bourbon, too.

Natcher. Doctor, I remember in 1964, when we had the Surgeon General before one of our committees, and that was at the time of the smoking report, as you recall. The Surgeon General was a right able man, just like you are, Doctor, and he said to us emphatically — when you burn tobacco and spinach, you get the same result. You agree with that, don't you?

Rauscher. It certainly looks that way.

Natcher. Don't you get the same result?

Rauscher. Yes, you do.

Natcher. Thank you, Doctor. I knew you would answer it that way . . .

Patten. . . Now on vinyl chloride, do you know how many plants I have [in my Congressional District] that use vinyl chloride?

Rauscher. No, sir.

Patten. Fifty. There is nothing wrong with vinyl chloride. We have 500,000 people working in the

chemical industry. I have had a lead factory in my town all my life — copper works, we have zinc. I go to the funeral parlors. I seldom see anyone die from vinyl chloride, or lead, or copper poisoning. . . . we are doing quite a bit of work, and always have in studying the occupational risks of the metals and the chemicals.

Rauscher. Some industries do very, very well.

Patten. . . One more thing. You published an atlas, and you said my area around New Brunswick has the highest mortality rate from cancer in the world — 1950 to 1969. You know Doctor, we have that college entrance testing group right there in Princeton. I don't want to disillusion anybody, but I think it is a crime that we judge 10 million people going into college on the basis of those college entrance exams. They don't give any psychiatric test. This is not the basis for picking a cop or a lawyer. So that I am a little sour on the colleges escaping by using the college entrance test. Tell me, Doctor — in all seriousness — how good is this atlas that has my people in my area thinking they are all going to die of cancer? . . .

Rauscher. Mr. Patten, this is a record, really. Sort of a death indices that is carried by each state. It is actually a record of the people who have died from cancer, from different types of cancer in those areas. I might add, my own hometown, or very close to it, was also one of the highest in the country.

Patten. They draw maps. They take in the chairman's area. They draw maps — that is where the cancer air must come from. I mean it is the most ridiculous thing I ever saw.

Rauscher. Your question is a very important one . . .

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99  
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS  
300 N ZEEB RD  
ANN ARBOR MI 48106

### SGR Summer Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published September 1, following which the regular twice-monthly publication schedule will be resumed.



